APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/675,451	09/29/2000	Kevin A. Retlich	00AB187	9892

7590   04/22/2003

John J Horn
Allen-Bradley Company LLC
Patent Dept 704P Floor 8 T 29
1201 South Second Street
Milwaukee, WI 53204-2496

EXAMINER
TRAN, TAM D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2676	4

DATE MAILED: 04/22/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>03</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 February 2003* .

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-46* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-46* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

        1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

        3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United
> States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who
> has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention
> thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999

(AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined

was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C.

122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment

by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Richardson (USPN

6054987).

2.   In regard to claims 1, 14, 24, 32, 39, Richardson teaches the method of creating group

views of managed network (method of creating view of a system of network components), see

col.5 lines 59 – 67 and col.1 line 35- col.3 line 45, store in memory object of each component

data representative of the respective component and of a configuration of the component; see

col.2 lines 30-38; accessing the data from the memory objects via a data network; see col.1 lines

35-61; generating a user viewable representation of the system based upon the data, the

representation including representations of each component and a physical representation of the system; see col.2 lines 27-44.

3.   In regard to claims 2, 3, 20, 34-38, 40, 41, Richardson teaches the method of creating group views of managed network (method of creating view of a system of network components), wherein user is able to discover and display all of the network devices on the network and to proactively monitor and manage all servers on the network, and it is easy to manage network devices and optimize the configuration, see col.1 lines 36-61. It is inherent that the physical configuration of the component includes data representative of a location of the component in the system and physical dimension of a subunit of the system, every electrical component having electrical power load.

4.   In regard to claims 4, 5, 21, 22, 28, 29, Richardson teaches the method of creating group views of managed network (method of creating view of a system of network components), wherein each network device is graphically represented by an icon on the network node manager console, see col.1 lines 36-61. It is inherent that user viewable representation is provided in a window area of a computer monitor and including representation of each component and location of component with respect to other components of the system.

5.   In regard to claim 6, 19, 23, 30 Richardson teaches the method of creating group views of managed network (method of creating view of a system of network components). This makes it easy to determine the network status, see col.1 lines 36-61. It is inherent that representation includes indicia representative of an operational status.

6.   In regard to claims 7, 8, Richardson teaches the method of creating group views of managed network (method of creating view of a system of network components), wherein a

plurality of attribute values in a group view attribute list stored in a database, see col.5 line 59 –

col.6 line 20. It is inherent that a database for the system including the data stored in each

memory object, memory object is downloaded into the memory object from the database.

7.   In regard to claims 9,15, 45, 46 Richardson teaches the method of creating group views

of managed network (method of creating view of a system of network components), wherein

each network device is graphically represented by an icon on the network node manager console,

see col.1 lines 36-61 and col. 3 lines 1-15. It is inherent that the user viewable representation is

provided at a monitoring station coupled to the system via the data network which has internet

protocol.

8.   In regard to claim 10, 18, Richardson teaches the method of creating group views of

managed network (method of creating view of a system of network components), wherein server

running the appropriate agent software responds to management data request from the console,

see col.2 lines 26- 45. It is inherent that the memory objects are reprogrammable by the monitor

station.

9.   In regard to claim 11, 16, 17, 25-27, 33 Richardson teaches the method of creating group

views of managed network (method of creating view of a system of network components),

wherein servers are graphically represented with a server icon; server running appropriate agent

software may be managed by a user from the console, see col.2 lines 26- 45. It is inherent that

monitoring station accesses a database containing system description data for generation of the

user viewable representation.

10.   In regard to claim 12, 44 Richardson teaches the method of creating group views of

managed network (method of creating view of a system of network components), wherein a

plurality of attribute values in a group view attribute list stored in a database, see col.5 line 59 –

col.6 line 20. It is inherent that database include configuration data.

11.   In regard to claim 13, 31, 42, 43, Richardson teaches the method of creating group views

of managed network (method of creating view of a system of network components), wherein

user is able to discover and display all of the network devices on the network and to proactively

monitor and manage all servers on the network, and it is easy to manage network devices and

optimize the configuration, see col.1 lines 36-61. It is inherent that a plurality of links to user

viewable representation for each component.

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments filed on 02/19/2003, have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

Applicant argues that the prior art does not teach " storing in a memory object of each

component data representative of the respective component and of a physical configuration of

the component; electrical power control component disposed in an enclose set." However,

examiner respectfully disagrees with the argument because on col.2 lines 27-45, Richardson

discloses storing in a memory object of each component data representative of the respective

component and of a physical configuration of the component; on col.1 lines 19-21, Richardson

discloses network components includes networked personal computers. The examiner notes that

all electrical power control component disposed in an enclose set. Applicant also argues the

usage of inherence in the examiner's rejections. Examiner uses inherence for the rejection base

on the description above the inherent statement. For these reasons, the rejections are maintained.

2.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from

the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the

mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the

THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on

the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be

calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory

period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

12.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to **Tam D. Tran** whose telephone number is **703-305-4196**. The

examiner can normally be reached on MON-FRI from 8:30 – 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, **Matthew Bella** can be reached on **703-308-6829**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered response should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,

Arlington, VA, Sixth floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose

telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Tam Tran

TT

Examiner

Art unit 2676

MATTHEW C. BELLA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600